DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 287 300 FL 016 956

AUTHOR Kamprath, Christine K.
TITLE Stress-Based Lexical Stratification in a Rato-Romansh Dialect.
PUB DATE 29 Dec 86
NOTE 10p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America (New York, NY, December 27-30, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Dialects; Foreign Countries; *Language Patterns; *Lexicology; Linguistic Theory; *Morphemes; *Phonology; *Stress (Phonology); Suffixes; Suprasegmentals; Syllables; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS *Romansh

ABSTRACT

A dialect of Rato-Romansh spoken in a Swiss town is examined in the context of lexical phonology. The structure of this dialect's lexicon consists of two levels defined by stress assignment, not cyclically in this case but at the end of each level. Other considerations that have been advanced as bases for level division within the lexicon, such as inflection versus derivation or affixing versus compounding, are either irrelevant or dependent on stress assignment in this language. These assertions are supported by illustrations from the dialect. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED287300

Christine K. Kamprath
University of Texas at Austin

1986 LSA Annual Meeting
New York, December 29, 1986

Stressed-Based Lexical Stratification in a Räto-Romansh Dialect

The theory of lexical phonology (Kiparsky 1982, Mohanan 1982, Halle and Mohanan 1985, etc.) proposes a word-formation component, the lexicon, which may be divided into discrete levels in which certain morphological processes apply and to which certain phonological rules are assigned.

In this paper, we examine a dialect of Räto-Romansh, namely that spoken in the town of Bergün in the Alps of southeastern Switzerland (data from Lutta 1923, Cloetta 1964). We motivate the structure of the lexicon in this language as consisting of two levels defined on the basis of stress assignment, which, we argue, applies twice within the lexicon, not cyclically, but once at the end of each level. We show furthermore that other considerations which have been advanced as bases for level division within the lexicon, such as inflection vs. derivation or affixation vs. compounding, are either irrelevant or dependent on stress assignent in this language.

Let's look at the data. In Bergüner-Romansh, stress can fall on more than one syllable within a word, an indication that the stress application rule applies more than once. For example, in the word [ómíŋ] 'little man' (Figure 1),

(1) [ómíŋ] 'little man'

both syllables are stressed. It is evident that the first syllable is stressed because the vowel there is not reduced: it has not undergone the exceptionless rule by which vowels in unstressed syllables are reduced to either [i], [u], or [ə] (Figure 2).

FL016956

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Kamprath

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

(2) Vowel Reduction in Unstressed Syllables

stressed		unstressed
[i], [e]	→	[i]
[u], [o]	→	[u]
[ɛ], [ɔ], [a]	→	[ə]

Since this vowel is none of these three reduced vowels, it cannot be the output of the vowel reduction rule, and thus the syllable in which it occurs is not unstressed. Evidence that the second syllable is also stressed resides in the realization of the final nasal as velar [ŋ]. We have demonstrated elsewhere (Kamprath 1987) that [ŋ] is not present in underlying representation but is rather the output of a rule which produces [ŋ] in the environment following a stressed vowel. Thus [ŋ] appears in this context by virtue of the fact that the preceding vowel is stressed, and therefore we have two applications of stress in the word [ómíŋ].

Examination of the stress facts of a word such as [ómíŋ] may suggest that stress application is cyclic, that is, that it applies each time a new morpheme is affixed. However, this is not so. It is not the case that all morphologically complex words have two stresses, which in this language is the maximum. In the [ómíŋ] example, stress does apply once on the stem ([om] 'man') and once again on the affix ([-íŋ] 'diminutive'). But in an example like [ɒuntɛ́t] 'goodness', stress applies only once. The stem in this word may surface independently as [ɒuŋ] 'good'; the affix is the nominalizer /-tɛd/, whose /d/ undergoes final devoicing. If [ɒuntɛ́t] were to undergo stress application twice, as does [ómíŋ], it would be realized as *[ɒúŋtɛ́t], with a velar nasal following

the stressed vowel in the first syllable.

How are we to account for the fact that stress applies twice in [ómíŋ] and only once in [ɒuntét]? As we have seen, if stress application were cyclic, both of these forms would manifest the same stress pattern. We suggest that the lexicon is divided into two levels, and that stress applies once at the end of each level. Particular affixes are assigned to one level or the other depending upon the stress patterns of the words in which they occur. That is, certain affixes are associated with the first application of stress and other affixes are associated with the second application. So [-tét] is a level 1 affix, and [-íŋ] is a level-2 affix. Notice that in this language derivation vs. inflection does not appear to have a role in dividing the lexical rule component. Both [-tét] and [-íŋ] are derivational affixes, though they are affixed on separate levels. Likewise, affixation and compounding do not define levels, but are subordinate to stress assignment, and may both occur on level 2.

Let us examine the affixes of this language to determine on which level of the lexicon they are affixed (Figure 3). This decision is made on the basis of the number of stresses in the words to which they affix. Affixes which appear in words manifesting two stresses are very straightforwardly assigned. If a word has two stressed syllables, and stress applies once at the end of each level, then its rightmost affix is a level-2 affix. The phonological material to the left of that

(3) Level Two affixes: two stresses in words in which they occur:

a)	[-ɛt] 'diminutive':	[lájét] 'little lake', [ištóargéta] 'little story', [míɡréta] 'little mouse', cf. [díɡrə] ~ [dirér] '(3s ~ infin.) say'.
b)	[-éca] 'nominalizer':	[əmiégvléca] 'friendliness', [ótéca] 'height'
c)	[-uŋ], 'aug/pej':	[ómúŋ] 'big, hulking man', [səblóŋúŋ] 'big beach.'

affix is the output of level-1 morphology, and received an application of stress at the end of level 1.

Level-2 affixes include [-iŋ], as we have seen. Another is the suffix [-ɛt], also a diminutive. Examples of its occurrence include [lájɛ́t] 'little lake', [ištóərgɛ́tə] 'little story', [mígrɛ́tə] 'little mouse'. Notice that each of these examples has 2 stresses, one on the [-ɛt] suffix, with its unreduced vowel. In [lájɛ́t] the /a/ is unreduced; in [ištóərgɛ́tə] the /o/ is followed by the epenthetic [ə] offglide present only following stressed vowels; and in [mígrɛ́tə] notice the [g], which is a so-called "hardened glide", the output of a rule by which offglides preceding a consonant are realized as velar stops. In unstressed syllables such a glide is deleted by the action of the Unstressed Nucleus Reduction rule, which produces alternations such as [dígrə] ~ [direŕ] '(3s ~ infin.) say'. Since the hardened glide shows up in [mígrɛ́tə], that syllable must be stressed.

Other suffixes which appear in words with two stresses include the nominalizing suffix [-écə], which appears in words such as [əmiégvlécə] 'friendliness' and [ótécə] 'height'; and the augmentative/pejorative suffix [-uŋ], appearing in such words as [ómúŋ] 'big, hulking man' and [səblóŋúŋ] 'big beach.' In each of these examples, the stressed status of syllables is displayed either by the presence of a non-reduced vowel, or else by the presence of a phonological element which can only accompany a stressed syllable, such as a velar nasal.

All of these morphemes must be affixed on level 2 prior to the affixation of the feminine

marker /-a/, which appears in [mígrétə] (the /-a/ having undergone unstressed reduction to [ə]). Furthermore, the plural morpheme must be affixed after the feminine marker, since it is always the last morpheme to be affixed to a nominal form, e.g., [mígrétəs]. Thus, both the feminine and the plural morphemes are level-two affixes.

All other nominal affixes apply at level 1, because only one syllable in words in which they appear is stressed. We have already mentioned the nominalizer [-tɛd]. Other level-1 affixes include [-uks] , [-det] , and [-ɛgvl] :

(4) Level 1 affixes: one stress in words in which they occur:

a) /-uws/ --> [-uks] (by Glide Hardening and Final Devoicing), an adjective ending occurring in such alternations as

[sɛvókr̥] 'flavor' ~ [sɛvurúks] 'flavorful',
[ʒej] 'juice' ~ [ʒiúks] 'juicy',
[gwœ́tər] 'goiter' ~ [gutrúks] 'goiterous', and
[mɛ́ndə] 'defect ~ [mɛndúks] 'defective';

b) [-det], similar in meaning to [-tɛd], appears in such alternations as

[saŋ] 'healthy' ~ [sɛndét] 'health',
[vɛkr̥] 'true' ~ [vɛrdét] 'truth',
[nar] 'crazy' ~ [nɛrdét] 'craziness', and
[fɔs] 'false' ~ [fuzdét] 'falsehood'

c) [-ɛgvl] '-able'

[ɛméj] 'friend ~ [ɛmiégvɛl] 'friendly'

This level assignment of nominal affixes is supported by examples containing multiple affixes. One such example is [ɓuntɛdégvɛl] 'kindly', consisting of the stem /bun/ 'good/ and two level-1 affixes, [-tɛd] and [-ɛgvɛl] . That both affixes are level 1 is attested to by the fact that

the word has only one stress. (Recall the word [bunt́ɛ́t], where the level 1 affix [-tɛd] received a stress.) Another example is [əmiɛ́gvlɛ́cə] 'friendliness', consisting of the stem [əmi-], underlyingly /amé̱j/ 'friend', the level-1 affix [-ɛ́gvl] and the level-2 affix [-ɛ́cə]. If both affixes were level-1 affixes, we would have only one stress in the word, as we have in [buntədɛ́gvəl]. But since we have two stresses in the word, we argue that the two affixes apply on two separate lexical levels.

We summarize the assignment of these affixes in Figure 5.

(5) Lexical Assignment of Affixes

Level One Affixes	
-uws (--› [-uks])	[səvurúks] 'flavorful', [ʒiúks] 'juicy'
-det	[səndét] 'health', [vərdét] 'truth', [nərdét] 'craziness', [fuzdét] 'falsehood'
-tɛd (-tɛt)	[buntét] 'goodness, [fidəltét] 'fidelity'
-ɛgv(ə)l	[buntədégvəl] 'kindly', [əmiɛ́gvəl] 'friendly'
Level Two Affixes	
-in (--› [-iŋ]	[ómíŋ] 'little man', [c̃ésíŋə] 'little house', [kəntóŋíŋ] 'little corner'
-ɛt	[lájét] 'little lake', [ištóərgɛ́tə] 'little story', [mígrétə] 'little mouse'
-un (--› [-uŋ])	[ómúŋ] 'big, hulking man', [səblóŋúŋ] 'big beach.'
-ɛca (--› [-ɛcə])	[əmiégvlécə] 'friendliness', [ótɛ́cə] 'height'
-a (--› [-ə]	'feminine marker'
-s	'plural marker'
Verbal Inflection	

Evidence for stressed-based lexical stratification is also apparent in the stress patterns of some verbs, namely forms of the future tense. It is generally held that the future tense of Romance verbs is formed on the basis of the infinitive. That is, the infinitive form is the stem onto which future endings are suffixed. This appears to be the case in this Räto-Romansh dialect as well, which we exemplify in Figure 6.

(6) Infinitive Types

	Infinitive	Future	Vowel Alternant	Gloss
1. -er	ĉəntér	ĉəntərɔ́	ĉáŋtə (3s)	'sing'
2. -ɛkr̥	g'udékr̥	g'udərɔ́	g'ódə (3s)	'rejoice'
3. -ər	vɛ́ndər	vɛ́ndərɔ́	vəndéks (2pl)	'sell'
4. -ekr̥	durmékr̥	durmərɔ́	dóərmə (3s)	'sleep'
5. -ekr̥	pətékr̥	pətirɔ́	pətɛ́š, pətéks	'suffer'

The forms crucial to this discussion are those of the 3rd conjugation, the only one in which the stress in the infinitive falls on the stem rather than on the infinitive ending, which consists of final -r preceded by some vowel or diphthong (recall the hardened glide, the velar obstruent, which here devoiced word-finally). In the 3rd conjugation form of the future tense, two stresses occur, one one the stem, one on the future ending. Thus future affixation occurs on level 2 and the infinitive is the output of level 1, where it received its own stress. We have argued elsewhere that future formation includes a process by which the Nucleus preceding the -r of the infinitive loses its feature specification and is filled in redundantly by the features which specify the unmarked vowel in this language, namely [ə]. The loss of these features occasions the loss of pre-r stress in all infinitives except the [vɛ́ndər] type which had no stress there to begin with; thus this [vɛ́ndər] type alone retains its stem stress to attest to a level-1 application of a stress in addition to the stress

which applies on level 2 after affixation of the future endings.

These data, like the nominal data, support our claim that stress applies a maximum of twice in a word, but not with every affixation. That is, it applies not cyclically but once per lexical level. They also illustrate our claim that derivational and inflectional morphology are not assigned separate tiers: both apply at least on level 2. Furthermore, although we show no compounding data, having encountered none in our corpus, we predict that, if the expected pattern of separate stress assignment to each unit of the compound occurs, compounding will occur on level 2. We suggest that the assignment of compounding to level 2 is based not on the notion that level 2 is the compounding level but rather on the general principles of level assignment based on stress patterns. Notice furthermore, that this analysis makes no mention of cyclic or non-cyclic levels. It appears that there are no phonological rules in this language which apply cyclically. This is due to the limited number of phonological rules which must apply lexically and to the fact that those which do apply in the lexicon apply so late as not to encounter the structural description which would cause them to apply more than once. We argue elsewhere that the majority of rules in the language apply post-lexically ordered only by putative universal principles such as the Elsewhere Condition. This does not challenge the claim that all lexical phonological rules are cyclic: in this language they happen not to have the chance to apply cyclically. However, the rule of stress assignment likewise does not apply cyclically, even though there are plenty of morphological cycles on which it could apply. This fact attests to the notion that prosodic rules, though lexical and phonological, are not of the same status as segmental phonological rules and do not necessarily conform to the same principles of application.

References

Cloetta, Z. Z. 1964. Igl Pled da Bravegn. Unpub. ms.

Halle, M. and K. P. Mohanan. 1985. Segmental Phonology of Modern English. LI 15.1.57-116.

Kamprath, C. 1987. Suprasegmental Structures in a Räto-Romansh Dialect: A Case Study in Metrical and Lexical Phonology. University of Texas at Austin Doctoral Dissertation.

Kiparsky. P. 1982. Lexical Morphology and Phonology. In I.-S. Yand ed., Linguistics in the Morning Calm. Seoul: Hanshin.

Mohanan, K. P. 1982. Lexical Phonology. MIT Doctoral Dissertation.

Lutta, C.M. 1923. Der Dialekt von Bergün und seine Stellung innerhalb der rätoromanischen Mundarten Graubündens. Supplement to Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie, #71.